



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JIGJR.: 02-05

Paper No:

CONOCO PHILLIPS COMPANY
600 NORTH DAIRY ASHFORD
HOUSTON TX 77079-1175

COPY MAILED

FEB 02 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Beuke, et al. :
Application No. 10/054,006 :
Filing Date: 21 January, 2002 :
Attorney Docket No. 9583.0-01 :
:

This is a decision on the petition filed on 20 December, 2004, alleging unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is
GRANTED.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 27 June, 2003, with response due absent extension of time on or before Monday, 29 September, 2003;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 29 September, 2003;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 30 January, 2004;

- on 20 December, 2005, Petitioner filed the instant petition and fee, the reply in the form of a request for continued examination (RCE), fee, and submission in the form of an amendment, and made the statement of unintentional delay;
- for reasons that are unclear, despite the abandoned status of the application, the Examiner nonetheless issued a final Office action on the matter on 13 January, 2005.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and--where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee.

Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

Given the period for which the instant application was abandoned, the record (including the petition filed on 20 December, 2004) does not necessitate a finding that the delay between midnight 27 September, 2003, and 20 December, 2004, was not unintentional.

Rather, the Patent and Trademark Office is relying in this matter on duty of candor and good faith of Petitioner/Counsel Bronwyn A. Welvaert (Reg. No. 52,350) when accepting Petitioners' representation that the delay in filing the response was unintentional.⁷

CONCLUSION

The instant petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is **granted**.

The instant application is released to Technology Center 1700 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gilton, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

⁷ See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).